DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 942 EA 021 969

AUTHOR Weller, L. David; And Others
TITLE Attitudes of American School Superintendents toward the Georgia Certification Test for School Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 16-20, 1990). Last two pages may reproduce poorly due to small type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Qualifications; *Certification; Educational Equity (Finance); Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; Public Schools; *Superintendents; *Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Competency Tests; *Georgia

ABSTRACT

Although recent research studies have questioned the efficacy of certification testing, Georgia's Department of Education, with help from National Evaluation Systems, developed the Georgia Certification Test in Administration and Certification (GCT). Since 1983, the test has been required for both certification and recertification. The present study used two instruments to assess the importance and usefulness of the GCT's test objectives. The first instrument, the School Operations and Instructional Supervision (SOIS), covered 29 of the GCT's objectives related to management of school operations and instructional supervision. The second instrument, Leadership Overview and Personnel Management (LOPM), covered 33 GCT objectives related to educational leadership and personnel management. Variables for importance and use were measured using a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Using "Patterson's American Education Directory" (1988), a random sample of 1,023 public school superintendents from all 50 states was selected. There was a 55 percent return rate. Study data show that a majority of respondents perceived all objectives on the SOIS and the LOPM inventories as being relatively high in importance and also frequently used in the superintendency. Study participants supported the underlying efficacy of the GCT's content, lending significant credibility to the test's validity. Several tables and the SOIS and LOPM inventories are included. (22 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328942

Attitudes of American School Superintendents toward the Georgia Certification Test for School Administrators

L. David Weller

Carl J. Schnittjer

William Gene Love

University of Georgia

Address all Correspondence to:

L. David Weller
G-10 Aderhold Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. David Weller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 969

At various levels of government there has been an increasing concern for the demonstration of educator accountability. The focus of this research is on one result of the accountability movement--certification testing of educators. In this regard, the sections that follow set the stage for examining validity concerns related to the certification testing movement. More specifically, the study examines the perceptions of public school superintendents in the United States relative to Georgia's certification test for school administrators and supervisors.

National Level Politics

Interest and involvement in education at the national level has reflected our social concern for the promotion of educational excellence and equity through a variety of legislative acts (Innoccone, 1987). For example, the 1950s witnessed the passage of the National Defense Education Act (1958). This act provided matching funds for states and local districts to enhance instruction in mathematics and sciences, and to restore America to worldwide scientific preeminence. Federal legislation during the next two decades focused on political and social issues which were targeted toward alleviating poverty, promoting human rights, and enhancing educational opportunities for deprived and special needs students. Legislation such as the Civil Rights Act (1964), Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975) viewed schools as a primary vehicle for social and educational reform.

In the 1980s, however, federal interest in education tended to move away from concerns related to social equity and shifted back toward the promotion of excellence

within education. For example, in the 1983 report A Nation at Risk, the National Commission on Excellence in Education warned that American public education was "being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity." Reform reports such as this focused on student performance requirements and teacher quality. Remedies such as increased high school graduation standards and minimum test requirements for graduation and/or grade-to-grade promotion were widely adopted through state legislation. Testing of teachers for minimum competency evolved nationally out of the concern for excellence. In this regard, an influencing factor was the established practice of student competency testing.

State Level Politics In Georgia

State officials in Georgia, as in many other states, were concerned about excellence and supported many of the recommendations made by the National Commission on Excellence in Education. State leaders knew that such efforts would be the responsibility of the states because of the Reagan Agenda to decentralize and deregulate education (Guthrie & Koppich, 1987). As a result, state governors appointed fact finding commissions to develop recommendations for state level reforms. These recommendations were based on research regarding effective schools, the public's concerns over quality of instruction, declining student test scores, and the need to demonstrate educator competency. Resulting legislation tended to de-emphasize the equity aspects associated with prior legislation based on the rationale that equal access to education has little value if that access is to an inferior product (Timer & Kirp, 1988).

This concern over an inferior product as well as many of the recommendations called for by A Nation at Risk clearly influenced the passage of Georgia's educational legislation. The Quality Basic Education Act (QBE) of 1985, one of the nation's first state reform acts, focused on achieving excellence in public education and demonstrating educator competency. QBE established state level government (Governor, Legislature, State Board of Education, etc.) as the primary body for policy making and for defining the educational roles and responsibilities of local school districts. Comprehensive and detailed in scope, QBE required the Georgia State Board of Education to make policy, set all minimum standards, and to develop procedures for implementing QBE.

As a centralized model for school governance, QBE mandated competency testing for teacher and administrator certification, established a statewide basic curriculum which included higher academic standards, and increased testing of student achievement in grades one through ten. Here, it is important to note that the mandated testing of educators for certification raised major questions regarding professional standards and ethics and legal concerns (Chernoff, Nassif, & Gorth, 1987).

Georgia's Political Players

In Georgia, the desire for excellence enjoyed strong public support. For example, state level politicians (i.e. Governor, the Legislature, etc.) seeking either election or reelection to office incorporated educational reform measures as planks in their campaign platforms. Success at the polls tended to reinforce the belief that

educational excellence had a high priority for Georgians and that the general Public, a major political force, had significant concern about problems in education. As noted earlier, a central element of proposed educational reform was the testing of educators to demonstrate competency. In this regard, three other groups were significant players in the Georgia's educational political setting: Practitioners (teachers, administrators, etc.), "Interfacers" (State Board of Education, State Superintendent, and State Department of Education), and educational Researchers.

From the beginning, testing for competency from the Practitioners point of view ranged from benevolent tolerance to outright hostility toward a requirement viewed as an infringement on their rights and an affront to their professional preparation. Interfacers made up a small but politically significant segment of Georgia's educational community, and provided the primary "interface" between Practitioners, Politicians, and the general Public. In this regard, the Interfacers worked in the political arena to influence and create perceptions in two directions. That is, the Interfacers attempted to influence perceptions of the Public and Politicians regarding the efficacy and quality of education. And, the Interfacers also communicated the concerns of the Public and Politicians to the Practitioners. That is, the Interfacers initiated the developmented specific policies, procedures, and practices in response to the concerns of the Public and Politicians. In doing this, they simultaneously reflected the realities and constraints of the educational setting where Practitioners "live."

Researchers, on the other hand, evidenced somewhat more esoteric concerns about the competency testing requirements for educators. As a result, a number of

issues regarding competency testing continue to be raised and examined in the framework of research practice and dialogue. While most Interfaces endorsed competency testing as a positive mechanism to assure educator competency, Researchers were able to articulate and raised questions regarding the potentially (and politically) seductive myth of competency testing--that competency testing assures quality teaching. This myth appears to be a primary motivator for the current certification testing movement across the United States.

Interfacers were pressured from the larger political setting to demonstrate accountability (educator competency) in Georgia's public education. In this setting, competency testing of Practitioners offered a particularly attractive political strategy. With this strategy, Interfacers could promote the concept of quality control as a way to assure competency prior to initial certification and practice. It carried an appealing (and seductive) logic which implied that testing would screen out incompetent Practitioners and insure the Public and Politicians that only "competent" educators would be employed in Georgia schools.

Issues and Concerns Related to Certification Testing

Researchers, continuing to chip away at this myth, focused arguments on the terminology of competency testing vs. certification testing. They also focused on other issues, for example test validity, related to the practice of certification testing (Beckhan, 1980; Sandefur, 1984; Stedman, 1984). Hyman (1984) and others (Schnittjer & Flippo, 1984; Madaus & Pullin, 1987) noted the increasing awareness among Researchers that the terms competency based certification testing are probably not defensible.

While competency testing is part of the certification requirements in most states, Researchers doubted the dependability of these tests as a valid indicator of a Practitioner's level of competency. Consequently, it was concluded that the term "certification testing" was more appropriate than the term "competency testing." This shift in word usage appears to reflect an awareness that the term competency based testing may not be either an accurate reflection of what is being tested or legally defensible based on standards of test validity and reliability (Sanderfur, 1988). Hyman further noted the overall logic behind competency testing argues that passing such tests demonstrates a knowledge of the field and that students being taught by such teachers are bound to learn more. However, Hyman found no evidence to show competency tests verified teacher competency, and suggested testing is primarily a politically useful devise for Interfacers to employ as evidence of accountability and concern for excellence in education.

As a corollary, Chernoff, Nassif, and Gorth (1987) argued that competency tests for educators were not a panacea for guaranteeing competency in the classroom. They and others (e.g., Schnittjer & Flippo, 1984) challenged the assumption that passing a paper and pencil test demonstrated competency. Specifically, they questioned whether this kind of test can capture the full range of skills and knowledge necessary to function effectively as teachers. In a related study, Pugack and Raths (1983) found little evidence to support a correlation between competency test performance and effectiveness in the classroom.

Testing also raised concerns over discrimination against minorities. Melnick and Pullin (1987) reported that states having certification testing showed proportionately more minorities being screened out than those from the majority group. Studies in Texas (Shepard & Kreitzer, 1987) and Georgia (Schnittjer & Flippo, 1984) also found minority pass rates on competency based certification tests to be lower than for other populations.

Another concern over certification testing focused on the validity of test items as they related to job performance criteria. Lines (1985) and Popham and Kirby (1987) found that competency tests for entry into the teaching profession focused mostly on basic literacy skills and provided no assessment of teaching competency. Convincingly, Anrig (1986) stated that "we should recognize tests can present and measure only a sample of the knowledge required for teaching. No test results guarantee that a prospective teacher will succeed and become a really good teacher in the classroom" (p. 448).

Court cases have also focused on the question of test validity. For example, McCarthy (1985) found that testing requirements for hiring and reemployment decisions violated the equal protection clause. She cited a Mississippi ruling by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals which found no evidence showing that a designated score on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) would effectively measure teaching competency. McCarthy also pointed out that courts have relied on Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to conclude that specific tests cannot be used for employment decisions in the absence of proof substantiating the practice. More importantly,

McCarthy stated that some courts have held that tests had to be job related and reflect some specific criteria such as a job description.

As this section has illustrated, Researchers have articulated inconsistencies and generates findings which clearly support a number of concerns regarding the efficacy of certification testing. However, the seductiveness of the myth remains potent and enduring. Tests employed for certification purposes (as in Georgia) continue to be used by Interfacers as evidence of concern for quality control despite the persuasive arguments posed by Researchers against such practices.

The Study

The conceptual framework of the study was grounded in the accountability movement and the recent call for excellence in education. The lack of educator credibility, as perceived by the Public, state Politicians, and state level Interfacers, motivated the development of strategies designed to insure educator competence and to promote student achievement in the State of Georgia's public schools. Beyer (1985) found that the most popular means used to demonstrate accountability (educator competence) was to adopt some form of competency testing for preservice or inservice educators, or for both. The basic rationale was that screening educators' in terms of their qualifications for classroom instruction would promote student learning and increase student performance on standardized tests. For example, in 1986, forty-six states had legislation requiring competency testing of teachers as a requirement for certification (Sanderfur, 1988).

In contrast with the testing of teachers for certification, the testing of administrators, prior to certification, is a more recent phenomenon. In the past, administrators earned their certification through additional course credits, completing degree requirements, or attending district academics or institutes (Peterson, 1986). However, as Peterson cautioned, the demonstrated popularity of teacher testing may soon emerge nationally as part of administrative certification requirements. If this prediction is accurate, certain issues associated with certification testing for administrators will have to be addressed. First, the issue of test reliability and validity needs to be carefully considered. Second, the issue of disparate impact on minority populations is a major concern. In this regard, tests for administrator certification should be criterion referenced as opposed to norm referenced to assure that a disproportionate number of minorities are not eliminated (Smith, 1984). And third, tests for certification should be job related (McCarthy, 1985).

Moving in this direction, Georgia's Department of Education, along with National Evaluation Systems (a private corporation), developed a certification test as part of certification requirements for school administrators and supervisors. As the first state to move in this direction, over 350 Georgia practicing administrators (in 1978) rated job performance objectives regarding their Importance and frequency of Use. The goal being to customize a validated test with appropriate content knowledge and skills necessary to function as administrators and/or supervisors in Georgia's public schools (Roony & Schribuer, 1980). By 1980, all persons seeking initial certification in administration and supervision had to take the Georgia Certification Test in

Administration and Supervision (GCT). In 1983, the GCT was required for recertification. Currently, only two states outside of Georgia have enacted legislation mandating certification testing of school administrators--Oklahoma and South Carolina. Unique to Georgia, however, is the practice of testing administrators for both certification and recertification.

Purpose of the Study

In an effort to examine the credibility of the GCT (as a paper and pencil test) on a national level, this study was designed to assess the Importance and Usefulness of GCT's test objectives. A stratified random sample of superintendents in all 50 states was used to assess the Importance and Use of objectives found on the GCT. Data were secured through the use of two instruments (see Appendix) designed to assess attitudes regarding four of the seven content areas tested by the GCT.

The first instrument, School Operations and Instructional Supervision (SOIS), covered 29 of the objectives from the GCT over the knowledge areas of Management of School Operations (14 items) and Instructional Supervision (15 items). The second instrument, Leadership Overview and Personnel Management (LOPM), covered 33 objectives from the GCT over the knowledge areas of Overview of Leadership in Education (10 items) and Personnel Management (23 items).

The variables of Importance and Use for each objective were measured using a five-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5) that knowledge associated with each objective was Important and was Used in the superintendency. Content validity of the GCT objectives was previously established by

the Georgia State Department of Education and National Evaluation Systems. Reliability was established through a test-retest method. Pearson r coefficients (as a measure of reliability) for both Importance and Use of the knowledge and skills objectives on both instruments was .99.

Data Collection Procedures

Using the 1988 edition of Patterson's American Education Dictionary, a stratified (by state) random sample of 1,023 public school superintendents (from approximately 15,000) from all 50 states was selected. To facilitate data collection, the 1,023 randomly sampled superintendents were further randomly divided into two groups -- one group (512 superintendents) received the SOIS inventory and the other group (511 superintendents) received the LOPM inventory. To insure maximum representation from each state, twenty superintendents were selected from each of the fifty states except in those states having twenty or fewer superintendents. In these states, all superintendents were included. A total of 561 completed instruments were returned -- 300 SOIS and 261 LOPM which represented a 55 percent total return rate.

Research Hypotheses and Data Analysis

The study had two hypotheses. The first hypothesis was designed to compare Importance and Use ratings of superintendents' on each item for both instruments. The second hypothesis was designed to determine if there was a correlation between superintendents' Importance and Use ratings for each item for both instruments.

Ho:1. There was not a statistically significant difference between superintendents' mean Importance ratings and superintendents' mean Use rating for each item on the SOIS and the LOPM.

Ho:2. There was not a statistically significant correlation between superintendents' Importance ratings and superintendents' Use ratings for each item on the SOIS and LOPM.

Data for the first hypothesis were analyzed by the dependent t-test for differences between Importance and Use responses. For the second hypothesis, data were analyzed using the Pearson r since data derived from the instruments were considered to be interval in nature.

Discussion

The first hypothesis, comparing the Importance and Use of 62 objectives taken from the GCT, found that statistically significant differences existed for 38 of the 62 objectives. Of the 29 objectives contained in the SOIS inventory, 23 had probabilities associated with the t-values of .01 or smaller. For the LOPM inventory, 15 of the 33 items were found to have statistically significant differences between the item means for Importance and Use. Tables 1 and 2 present the t-test results for the SOIS inventory and for the LOPM inventory, respectively.

(Place Tables #1 and #2 About Here)

The overall Importance mean response for SOIS objectives was 4.15. As shown in Table 1, the means ranged from 3.34 for item 10 (impact of a school's physical environment ...) to 4.85 for item 3 (internal accounting procedures necessary for the

financial management of a school). On the other hand, the overall Use response mean on the SOIS was 4.07 and ranged from a low of 3.69 on item 3 (internal accounting procedures necessary for the financial management of a school) to 4.46 on item 6 (effective utilization of space in school buildings).

Table 2 presents the Importance and Use of knowledge areas on the LOPM inventory. The overall Importance mean response for LOPM inventory was 4.22. Response means in Table 2 ranged from 3.42 on item 16 (functions of the visiting school teacher in terms of state requirements) to 4.82 on item 8 (basic leadership competencies including problem solving, evaluation, public relations planning, and decision making skills). Use of objectives on the LOPM had an overall mean response of 4.14. The highest Use mean was for item 8 (basic leadership competencies including problem solving, evaluation, public relations planning, and decision making skills) with a 4.80 mean score. The lowest mean for Use was for item 16 (functions of the visiting teacher in terms of state attendance laws) with a 3.31 mean score.

Of interest is the fact that for both variables of Importance and Use on the LOPM, item 16 had the lowest mean response and item 8 had the highest response mean. When looking at mean ratings for both the SOIS and LOPM inventories, respondents were more likely to rate the Importance and Use of these objectives within the "strongly agree" to "agree" response range. This is a clear indication that these knowledge and skill areas were not only Important for the superintendency, but were also Used rather frequently.

When comparing the rankings between Importance and Use responses, some notable findings emerged. For example, there were distinct discrepancies on certain items on both the SOIS and LOPM inventories when Importance and Use rankings were compared. Tables 3 and 4 contain comparative rankings for Importance and Use on the SOIS and LOPM inventories, respectively.

(Place Tables #3 and #4 About Here)

Table 3, comparing mean rankings between Importance and Use responses for the SOIS inventory, shows items 7, 8, 13, and 27 are ones to which superintendents do not necessarily associate a high degree of Importance. However, their Use of these knowledge areas occurs rather frequently in the performance of their job. On the other hand, a high degree of Importance is associated with items 3, 4, 10, 17, 21, and 28, but the Use of these knowledge areas in the superintendency is somewhat less frequent than for other items. These knowledge areas deemed Important, but Used less frequently, were ones more likely to be performed by building level administrators.

Rankings of Importance and Use for objectives contained in the LOPM (See Table 4) reveal that items 6, 12, 21, and 25 are considered to be rather low in Importance to superintendents, but were Used rather frequently in the superintendency. Of interest is the fact that items 12 and 21 are concerned with special needs students, an area of responsibility usually designated to other supervisory personnel. Items 9, 14, and 22, however, were considered to be of high Importance to superintendents but were Used less frequently. Again, these knowledge areas are related to responsibilities normally assigned building level administrators.

The second hypothesis investigated the correlations between the ratings of superintendents regarding the Importance of these knowledge areas and superintendents ratings regarding the Use of these knowledge areas. Pearson r correlations were found to be significant for 12 of the 29 items on the SOIS inventory. Table 5 presents the correlations for each item on the SOIS inventory. When analyzing items on the LOPM inventory, Pearson r correlations were significant for all 33 items. Table 6 shows correlations for each item on the LOPM.

(Place Tables #5 and #6 About Here)

Conclusions and Implications

Data from this study support the conclusion that a majority of responding American public school superintendents perceived all objectives on the SOIS and LOPM inventories as being relatively high in Importance and also frequently Used in the superintendency. However, when inventory items on the instruments were ranked, some discrepancies existed when Importance and Use rankings were compared. One explanation for the discrepancies between Importance and Use rank orderings is that superintendents did not assume some of the responsibilities reflected in the knowledge areas, but in fact delegated these duties to building level administrators or supervisory personnel.

When comparing results of the Importance and Use ratings on both the SOIS and LOPM inventories, all items were noticeably skewed toward the "agree" and "strongly agree" end of the scale. Since no item on either instrument received an Importance or

Use mean rating of less than 3.31, it can be implied that there was substantial agreement about the Importance and Use of each objective.

Looking at the correlations between the Importance and Use factors on the SOIS and LOPM inventories, a noteworthy contrast occurred. Whereas only 12 of the 29 items on the SOIS inventory indicated statistically significant (but relatively low) correlations, all 33 items on the LOPM inventory yielded "moderate" to "high" correlations between Importance and Use ratings. This suggests that for some knowledge areas found on the SOIS inventory superintendents tended to associate Importance to the objectives, but did not necessarily Use them in the superintendency. For example, item 13 on the SOIS, "Bases for instructional supervision", is generally not one of the areas for which a superintendent would be likely to assume direct responsibility on a daily basis. Likewise, item 10 (Impact of a schools physical environment) and item 12 (Different approaches to instructional supervision) would not be typical tasks of the superintendent. On the other hand, item 1 (State education legislation as it relates to finance), item 8 (Appropriate methods to maintain school security), and item 14 (Planning and organizing the instructional process) are more likely to be responsibilities assumed by of the superintendent. Consequently, there was no indication that knowledge areas contained in both inventories were considered to be irrelevant.

These findings have several important implications. The results of this study provide significant base line data regarding the perceptions of American school superintendents in terms of the Importance and Use of objectives from the GCT.

Furthermore, the findings indicated that superintendents were in general agreement that the knowledge areas taken from the GCT were both Important and Used frequently in the superintendency. Research on the position of the public school superintendency is relatively new so that the results of this study provide a nationally focused examination of the self-perceived duties and responsibilities of superintendents. This is particularly important in that a review of the literature found no studies concerning the identification of superintendent job responsibilities and duties. Nor were studies found concerning the relative Importance and prominence of various tasks in the job of the superintendent.

The growing concern for the demonstration of competency through testing for school administrators, as part of certification requirements, is evidenced by the number of states considering testing programs. Here, it seems reasonable to assume that tests for the certification of superintendents should at least cover those knowledge areas considered to be Important and of Use in the performance of the job. By having certification tests which accurately incorporate job relatedness criteria and have demonstrated validity and reliability; Politicians, Interfacers, Practitioners, and the Public can have a reasonable certainty that superintendents are knowledgeable in the areas necessary to function in that capacity. In this study, superintendents from across the United States supported the efficacy of the underlying content of the GCT. This lends significant creditability to the validly of the test. Consequently, these findings, while not resolving the many issues related to certification testing, do suggest as a minimum, that the GCT has an appropriate coverage of those knowledge areas

for which a superintendent should be able to demonstrate literacy. In this regard, other states currently contemplating certification testing for superintendents may want to consider Georgia's test as a possible alternative as they initiate the development of their own certification testing programs.

References

Anrgi, G. R. (1986). Teacher education and teacher testing: The rush to mandate. Phil Delta Kappan, 67, 447-451.

Beckham, J. (1980). Legal implications of minimum competency testing. Phil Delta Kappan Fastback 138. Bloomington, Phil Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Beyer, L. (1985). Educational reform: The political rooks of national risk. Curriculum Inquiry, 15(1), 37-56.

Chernoff, M. Nassif, P., & Gorth, W. (Eds.). (1987). The validity issue: What should teacher certification tests measure? Hillsdale, NH: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Guthrie, J. W., & Koppich, J. (1987). Exploring the political economy of national education reform. In W. L. Boyd & C. T. Kerchner (Eds.), The Politics of Excellence and Choice in Education (pp. 25-47). New York: The Falmer Press.

Hyman, R. (1984). Testing for teacher competency: The logic, the law, the implications. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 14-18.

Innoccone, L. (1987). From equity to excellence: Political context and dynamics. In W. L. Boyd & C. T. Kerchner (Eds.), The Politics of Excellence and Choice in Education (pp. 49-65). New York: The Falmer Press.

Lines, P. M. (1985). Testing the teacher: Are there legal pitfalls? Phi Delta Kappan, 661(9), 618-622.

Madaus, G. F., & Pullin, D. (1987). Teacher certification tests: Do they really measure what we need to know? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 31-38.

Melnick, S. L., & Pullin, D. (1987). Testing teacher's professional knowledge: Legal and educational policy implications. Educational Policy, 1(2), 215-227.

McCarthy, M. M. (1985). Competency tests in public employment and legal views. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5(3), 250-562.

Patterson's American Education Dictionary. D. Moody (ed.). (1988). Mount Prospect, IL: Educational Directories, Inc.

Peterson, K. D. 91986). Principal's work, socialization and training: Developing more effective leaders. Theory Into Practice, 25(3), 151-152.

Popham, J. W., & Kirby, W. N. (1987). recertification tests for teachers: A defensible safeguard for society. Phil Delta Kappan, 69, 45-49.

Pugack, M. C. & Roths, J. D. (1983). Testing teachers: Analysis and recommendations. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 37-43.

Roony, M. & Schribuer, P. E. (1980). The Georgia administration and supervision criterion-referenced test project: Final report. Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Sandefur, J. T. (1984, April). Competency assessment of teachers: 1980-1983. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

Schnittjer, C. J. & Flippo, R. F. (1984). Competency based certification of school administrators: The Georgia experience. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.

Shepard, L. A & Kreitzer, A. E. (1987). The Texas teacher test. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, DC.

Smith, G. (1984). The critical issue of excellence and equity in competency testing. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 6-9.

Stedman, C. (1984). Testing for competency: A pyrrhic victory? Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 2-5.

Timer, T. B. & Kirp, D.L. (1988). Managing Educational Excellence. New York: The Falmer Press.

Table 1
School Operators and Instructional Supervision
Importance and Use t Tests

Item No.	Means		Standard Dev.		t	df	2-tail prob.
	Important	Use	Important	Use			
1	4.70	3.76	.56	.84	14.94[a]	299	<.001
2	4.71	3.99	.52	.69	14.95[a]	299	<.001
3	4.85	3.69	.36	.81	23.23[a]	299	<.001
4	4.84	4.08	.43	.68	16.83[a]	299	<.001
5	4.20	3.93	.76	.76	4.62[a]	299	<.001
6	4.12	4.46	.86	.63	-5.51[a]	299	<.001
7	4.02	4.36	.72	.70	-6.06[a]	299	<.001
8	3.93	4.08	.84	.63	-2.63[a]	299	.009
9	3.48	3.91	.90	.73	-7.08[a]	299	<.001
10	3.34	4.29	.97	.67	-14.37[a]	299	<.001
11	4.16	4.21	.68	.71	-.82	299	.411
12	4.12	4.20	.75	.68	-1.44	299	.150
13	4.19	4.03	.66	.77	2.75[a]	299	.006
14	4.13	4.34	.70	.63	-4.39[a]	299	<.001
15	3.86	4.19	.72	.76	-5.72[a]	299	<.001
16	3.81	4.19	.78	.78	-6.40[a]	299	<.001
17	4.18	3.87	.70	.87	5.26[a]	299	<.001
18	4.13	4.29	.77	.74	-2.84[a]	299	.005
19	4.08	4.00	.73	.89	1.27	299	.207
20	4.01	4.00	.78	.83	.11	299	.914
21	3.80	3.84	.73	.86	-.55	299	.584
22	3.63	4.13	.81	.71	-8.66[a]	299	<.001
23	4.46	3.98	.65	.80	8.77[a]	299	<.001
24	4.30	4.26	.72	.69	.84	299	.402
25	4.57	4.05	.57	.82	10.59[a]	299	<.001
26	4.43	4.19	.67	.66	5.03[a]	299	<.001
27	4.34	3.98	.62	.77	7.85[a]	299	<.001
28	4.19	4.00	.77	.76	3.50[a]	299	<.001
29	4.03	3.76	.72	.82	5.11[a]	299	<.001

[a]Statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Table 2
Leadership Overview and Personnel Management
Importance and Use t Tests

Item No.	Means		Standard Dev.		t	df	2-tail prob.
	Important	Use	Important	Use			
1	4.63	4.56	.59	.70	2.70[a]	260	.007
2	4.62	4.59	.51	.58	1.42	260	.158
3	4.55	4.55	.56	.56	-.15	260	.884
4	4.07	4.01	.73	.78	2.43	260	.016
5	4.38	4.35	.58	.64	1.27	260	.207
6	4.76	4.71	.44	.48	2.44	260	.015
7	4.36	4.33	.63	.71	.98	260	.328
8	4.82	4.80	.40	.42	1.42	260	.158
9	4.56	4.57	.56	.57	-.14	260	.887
10	4.54	4.54	.56	.58	.17	260	.866
11	3.99	3.90	.63	.68	2.95[a]	260	.003
12	3.86	3.82	.85	.87	1.39	260	.166
13	3.72	3.56	.69	.77	4.86[a]	260	.001
14	4.00	3.82	.57	.69	5.14[a]	260	<.001
15	3.81	3.69	.70	.79	3.61[a]	260	<.001
16	3.42	3.31	.90	.91	3.91[a]	260	<.001
17	3.64	3.55	.84	.87	3.04[a]	260	.003
18	4.30	4.16	.65	.75	4.58[a]	260	<.001
19	3.88	3.76	.91	.97	3.53[a]	260	<.001
20	4.12	3.95	.76	.86	5.27[a]	260	<.001
21	3.87	3.71	.85	.90	4.68[a]	260	<.001
22	4.34	4.32	.60	.63	.85	260	.397
23	4.19	4.14	.78	.80	1.99	260	.047
24	4.39	4.36	.61	.67	1.41	260	.160
25	4.24	4.21	.65	.72	1.13	260	.259
26	4.16	4.11	.66	.71	1.82	260	.070
27	3.92	3.81	.77	.84	3.77[a]	260	<.001
28	4.10	4.03	.86	.89	2.04	260	.042
29	3.84	3.72	.77	.85	4.02[a]	260	<.001
30	4.70	4.65	.52	.57	2.15	260	.032
31	4.41	4.35	.62	.67	2.43	260	.016
32	4.60	4.49	.55	.72	2.93[a]	260	.004
33	4.44	4.30	.63	.78	4.08[a]	260	<.001

[a]Statistically significant ($p < .01$).

Table 3
School Operations and Instructional Supervision
Importance and Use Response Mean Rankings

Item No.	Rank[a] Important	Use	Item No.	Rank[a] Importance	Use
1	2	6	16	14	13
2	4	7	17	6	19
3	2	14	18	12	20
4	1	10	19	19	28
5	25	18	20	29	2
6	23	24	21	7	23
7	26	11	22	20	27
8	27	12	23	8	5
9	24	15	24	15	9
10	5	16	25	16	17
11	28	26	26	21	21
12	13	22	27	22	1
13	17	4	28	9	29
14	11	8	29	10	3
15	18	25			

[a]I = Importance; U = Use

Table 4
Leadership Overview and Personnel Management
Importance and Use Response Mean Rankings

Item No.	Rank[a] Important	Use	Item No.	Rank[a] Importance	Use
1	8	8	18	23	23
2	6	6	19	26	26
3	30	30	20	20	28
4	1	2	21	28	4
5	2	9	22	4	20
6	32	1	23	14	11
7	9	3	24	11	12
8	3	10	25	27	14
9	10	32	26	19	27
10	33	24	27	21	19
11	31	31	28	12	29
12	24	5	29	9	21
13	5	7	30	15	15
14	7	22	31	13	13
15	22	33	32	17	17
16	18	25	3	16	16
17	25	18			

[a]I = Importance; U = Use

Table 5
School Operations and Instructional Supervision
Importance and Use Correlations
(Note: N= 300)

Item No.	Knowledge Areas	r	2-tail prob.
1	State education legislation as it relates to finance.	-.183	.001
2	School budget preparation.	.072	.212
3	Internal accounting procedures necessary for the fiscal management of a school.	.057	.329
4	Managing information in a school (e.g., reporting, recording, storing).	.079	.173
5	Scheduling of school activities.	.067	.251
6	Effective utilization of space in school buildings.	-.010	.868
7	School safety regulations.	.079	.173
8	Appropriate methods to maintain school security.	.161	.005
9	Management and operation of the school plant.	.190	.001
10	Impact of a school's physical environment (e.g., lighting, ventilation, crowding) on the physical, emotional, and mental status of the school's occupants.	.056	.335
11	Factors (e.g., legal requirements, financial) involved in providing food services for students.	.138	.017
12	Different approaches to instructional supervision (e.g., administrative supervision, clinical supervision, scientific supervision).	.095	.099
13	Bases for instructional supervision (e.g., improvement of instruction, changing role of teacher).	.093	.107
14	Planning and organizing the instructional process e.g., assign staff, arrange for in-service, assign facilities).	.249	.001
15	Basic teaching models (e.g., non-directive, inquiry, inductive teaching).	.097	.093
16	Appropriate patterns of grouping students for given situations (e.g., ability, multi-age, individualized).	.142	.014
17	Various sources of information to use in designing an instructional program (e.g., parent, teacher, student).	.154	.008
18	Involvement of the professional staff in planning and organizing the instructional process.	.088	.130

Table 5
School Operations and Instructional Supervision
Importance and Use Correlations
(Note: N= 300)

Item No.	Knowledge Areas	r	2-tail prob.
19	Factors involved in the acquisition and management of teaching/learning resources.	.016	.789
20	Evaluation of proposed plans for staff development.	.129	.025
21	Evaluation of staff development programs that have been conducted.	-.047	.421
22	Management of the instructional program (e.g., staffing, teacher assignment, space allocation).	.143	.013
23	Techniques for observing and analyzing instruction (e.g., self-analysis clinical analysis, observation).	.156	.007
24	Assessment of teaching performance (e.g., identify teacher goals, observation, evaluation, feedback).	.312	.001
25	Methods to help groups deal with common problems (e.g., role playing, brainstorming, buzz session).	.308	.001
26	Different types of training for the professional development of the instruction staff (e.g., workshop, visitations, credit courses).	.242	.001
27	Approaches for evaluating instructional outcomes (e.g., observing, testing, summative, formative).	.340	.001
28	Factors involved in establishing student performance criteria.	.268	.001
29	Types of tests in terms of their effectiveness in assessing instructional outcomes.	.310	.001

Table 6
Leadership Overview and Personnel Management
Importance and Use Correlations
(Note: N = 261)

Item No.	Knowledge Areas	r	2-tail prob.
1	Source of authority of boards of education, superintendents, and other administrators.	.763	.001
2	Factors involved in the formulation of educational policy.	.802	.001
3	Delegation of executive responsibilities in school administration.	.712	.001
4	Source of authority of supervisors in education.	.857	.001
5	Roles of various leadership personnel in the school organization structure.	.800	.001
6	Functions of administrative management such as planning, decision making, controlling, organizing, and evaluating.	.746	.001
7	Tasks involved in operational management including pupil personnel, facilities, and transportation.	.790	.001
8	Basic leadership competencies including problem solving, evaluation, public relations, planning, and decision making skills.	.796	.001
9	Factors involved in implementing change.	.705	.001
10	Ethics of administration.	.792	.001
11	Pupil personnel services including psychological, health/medical, social, and counseling/guidance services.	.705	.001
12	Legal requirements related to speech, auditory, and visual screening, immunization, and student in school medication.	.837	.001
13	Role of the school psychologist.	.722	.001
14	Purpose of counseling services.	.630	.001
15	Services available from remedial specialists (e.g., speech, auditory).	.751	.001
16	Functions of the visiting teacher in terms of state attendance laws.	.880	.001
17	Community health services relevant to student health needs.	.851	.001
18	Legal concerns regarding maintenance, protection, and utilization of student records.	.739	.001
19	The eleven types of special needs students defined by Public Law 94-142	.812	.001

Table 6
Leadership Overview and Personnel Management
Importance and Use Correlations
(Note: N = 261)

Item No.	Knowledge Areas	r	2-tail prob.
20	Provisions of Public Law 94-142 related to special needs students.	.821	.001
21	Identification, evaluation, and placement of special needs students leading to the Individualized Education Program (IEP).	.810	.001
22	Processes involved in establishing school system personnel needs.	.748	.001
23	Teacher certification requirements.	.871	.001
24	Certificated personnel policies, procedures, and issues (e.g., merit pay, tenure, workload, salary schedules).	.814	.001
25	Procedures for recruitment of certificated personnel.	.799	.001
26	Formulation of policies relevant to classified personnel (e.g., custodians, lunchroom workers, secretaries).	.826	.001
27	Procedures for the classification of classified personnel.	.840	.001
28	Structure and function of employee organizations (e.g., local teacher organizations).	.847	.001
29	Management of auxiliary personnel (e.g., teacher aides, student teachers, clerks).	.831	.001
30	Guidelines and standards concerning hiring and removal of certificated and classified personnel.	.766	.001
31	Dissemination of criteria to be used in evaluation of teachers for initial employment.	.903	.001
32	Evaluation of teachers for continuing employment.	.524	.001
33	Supervision of evaluation of beginning teachers.	.666	.001

LEADERSHIP OVERVIEW AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

APPENDIX

A. Age ____ B. Years of Experience as a Superintendent ____ C. Years of Experience as an Educator ____

D. Area of Initial Certification _____ E. School System Enrollment _____

F. Highest Professional Degree Earned (Circle One): Master's Specialist Doctorate

G. Circle One: APPOINTED or ELECTED H. Gender (Circle One): M F I. Race _____

DIRECTIONS: This instrument is designed to allow you to indicate your attitudes regarding the knowledge areas used as a basis for the Certification Test for school administrators in Georgia. For each of the knowledge areas listed below, indicate your attitudes concerning each of the two categories at the right by circling your response choice. The response options correspond to the following scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree N = Neither agree nor disagree A = Agree SA = Strongly Agree

KNOWLEDGE AREAS	YOUR ATTITUDES: This knowledge is important to my job as school superintendent	I use this knowledge in my job as school superintendent
1. Source of authority of boards of education, superintendents, and other administrators.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
2. Factors involved in the formulation of educational policy.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
3. Delegation of executive responsibilities in school administration.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
4. Source of authority of supervisors in education.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
5. Roles of various leadership personnel in the school organization structure.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
6. Functions of administrative management such as planning, decision making, controlling, organizing, and evaluating.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
7. Tasks involved in operational management including pupil personnel, facilities, and transportation.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
8. Basic leadership competencies including problem solving, evaluation, public relations, planning, and decision making skills.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
9. Factors involved in implementing change.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
10. Ethics of administration.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
11. Pupil personnel services including psychological, health/medical, social, and counseling/guidance services.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
12. Legal requirements related to speech, auditory, and visual screening, immunizations, and student in school evaluation.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA

(Continued on back)

	Knowledge is important	Knowledge is used
13. Role of the school psychologist.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
14. Purpose of counseling services.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
15. Services available from remedial specialists (e.g., speech, auditory).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
16. Functions of the visiting teacher in terms of state attendance laws.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
17. Community health services relevant to student health needs.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
18. Legal concerns regarding maintenance, protection, and utilization of student records.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
19. The eleven types of special needs students defined by Public Law 94-142.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
20. Provisions of Public Law 94-142 related to special needs students.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
21. Identification, evaluation, and placement of special needs students leading to the Individualized Education Program (IEP).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
22. Processes involved in establishing school system personnel needs.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
23. Teacher certification requirements.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
24. Certificated personnel policies, procedures, and issues (e.g., merit pay, tenure, workload, salary schedules).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
25. Procedures for recruitment of certificated personnel.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
26. Formulation of policies relevant to classified personnel (e.g., custodians, lunchroom workers, secretaries).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
27. Procedures for the classification of classified personnel.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
28. Structure and function of employee organizations (e.g., local teacher organizations).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
29. Management of auxiliary personnel (e.g., teacher aides, student teachers, clerks).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
30. Guidelines and standards concerning hiring and removal of certificated and classified personnel.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
31. Dissemination of criteria to be used in evaluation of teachers for initial employment.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
32. Evaluation of teachers for continuing employment.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
33. Supervision of evaluation of beginning teachers.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL OPERATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

A. Age ____ B. Years of Experience as a Superintendent ____ C. Years of Experience as an Educator ____

D. Area of Initial Certification _____ E. School System Enrollment _____

F. Highest Professional Degree Earned (Circle One): Master's Specialist Doctorate

G. Circle One: APPOINTED or ELECTED H. Gender (Circle One): M F I. Race _____

DIRECTIONS: This instrument is designed to allow you to indicate your attitudes regarding the knowledge areas used as a basis for the Certification Test for school administrators in Georgia. For each of the knowledge areas listed below, indicate your attitudes concerning each of the two categories at the right by circling your response choice. The response options correspond to the following scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree N = Neither agree nor disagree A = Agree SA = Strongly Agree

KNOWLEDGE AREAS	YOUR ATTITUDES: This knowledge is important to my job as school superintendent	YOUR ATTITUDES: I use this knowledge in my job as school superintendent
1. State education legislation as it relates to finance.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
2. School budget preparation.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
3. Internal accounting procedures necessary for the fiscal management of a school.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
4. Managing information in a school (e.g., reporting, recording, storing).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
5. Scheduling of school activities.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
6. Effective utilization of space in school buildings.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
7. School safety regulations.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
8. Appropriate methods to maintain school security.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
9. Management and operation of the school plant.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
10. Impact of a school's physical environment (e.g., lighting, ventilation, crowding) on the physical, emotional, and mental status of the school's occupants.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA

(Continued on back)

	Knowledge is important	Knowledge is used
11. Factors (e.g., legal requirements, financial) involved in providing food services for students.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
12. Different approaches to instructional supervision (e.g., administrative supervision, clinical supervision, scientific supervision).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
13. Bases for instructional supervision (e.g., improvement of instruction, changing role of teacher).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
14. Planning and organizing the instructional process (e.g., assign staff, arrange for in-service, assign facilities).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
15. Basic teaching models (e.g., non-directive, inquiry, inductive teaching).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
16. Appropriate patterns of grouping students for given situations (e.g., ability, multi-age, individualized).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
17. Various sources of information to use in designing an instructional program (e.g., parent, teacher, student).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
18. Involvement of the professional staff in planning and organizing the instructional process.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
19. Factors involved in the acquisition and management of teaching/learning resources.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
20. Evaluation of proposed plans for staff development.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
21. Evaluation of staff development programs that have been conducted.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
22. Management of the instructional program (e.g., staffing, teacher assignment, space allocation).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
23. Techniques for observing and analyzing instruction (e.g., self-analysis, clinical analysis, observation).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
24. Assessment of teaching performance (e.g., identify teacher goals, observation, evaluation, feedback).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
25. Methods to help groups deal with common problems (e.g., role playing, brainstorming, buzz session).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
26. Different types of training for the professional development of the instruction staff (e.g., workshops, visitations, credit courses).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
27. Approaches for evaluating instructional outcomes (e.g., observing, testing, summative, formative).	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
28. Factors involved in establishing student performance criteria.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA
29. Types of tests in terms of their effectiveness in assessing instructional outcomes.	SD D N A SA	SD D N A SA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE